arXiv:0902.0815v1 [math.RA] 4 Feb 2009

Centralizing automorphisms and Jordan left derivations on σ-prime rings

L. Oukhtite & S. Salhi
Université Moulay Ismaïl, Faculté des Sciences et Techniques
Département de Mathématiques, Groupe d'Algèbre et Applications
B. P. 509 Boutalamine, Errachidia; Maroc
oukhtitel@hotmail.com, salhi@math.net

Abstract

Let R be a 2-torsion free σ-prime ring. It is shown here that if $U \not\subset Z(R)$ is a σ-Lie ideal of R and a, b in R such that $aUb = \sigma(a)Ub = 0$, then either $a = 0$ or $b = 0$. This result is then applied to study the relationship between the structure of R and certain automorphisms on R. To end this paper, we describe additive maps $d : R \longrightarrow R$ such that $d(u^2) = 2ud(u)$ where $u \in U$, a nonzero σ-square closed Lie ideal of R.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: *16W10, 16W25, 16W20, 16U80.*
Key words and phrases: *σ-prime rings, centralizing automorphisms, Lie ideals, left derivations, Jordan left derivations.*

1 Introduction

Recently, there has been much interest in investigating the structure of a ring having commuting or centralizing mapping on a subset S of this ring. In [10] Posner showed that if a prime ring has a nontrivial derivation which is centralizing on the entire ring, then the ring must be commutative. In [3] the same result is proved for a prime ring with a nontrivial centralizing automorphism. A number of authors have generalized these results by considering mappings which are only assumed to be centralizing on an appropriate ideal of the ring. In [4] Mayne showed that if R is a prime ring with a nontrivial centralizing automorphism on a nonzero ideal or (quadratic) Jordan ideal, then R is commutative. For a prime ring with characteristic not two, an improved version was given in [5] by showing that a nontrivial automorphism which is centralizing on a Lie ideal implies that the ideal is contained in the center of the ring. In [8], we proved a corresponding result for σ-prime rings with σ-square closed Lie ideals, where σ is an involution. More precisely, for a σ-prime ring R with characteristic not 2 equipped with a nontrivial automorphism T centralizing on a σ-square closed Lie ideal U, it is proved that if T commutes with σ and there exists u_0 in $Sa_\sigma(R)$ with $Ru_0 \subset U$, then U is contained in $Z(R)$. This extends the result of [4] for centralizing automorphisms to σ-prime rings. Our first aim in this paper is to give a fundamental lemma which shows that if U is a noncentral σ-Lie ideal of R and a, b in R such that $aUb = \sigma(a)Ub = 0$, then $a = 0$ or $b = 0$, Lemma 4. The application of this lemma enables us to improve the result of [8] by showing that the existence of u_0 in $Sa_\sigma(R)$ such that $Ru_0 \subset U$ is not necessary, Theorem 1.

To end this paper, we present another field of application of Lemma 4 by studying the relationship between Jordan left derivations and left derivations on Lie ideals. A famous result due to Herstein [6] states that every Jordan derivation on a 2-torsion free prime ring is a derivation. Further, Awtar [1] generalized this result on square closed Lie ideals. In [7] Mohammad Ashraf and Nadeem -UR-Rehmman proved that if d is an additive mapping of a 2-torsion free prime ring R into itself satisfying $d(u^2) = 2ud(u)$, for all u in a square closed Lie ideal U of R, then $d(uv) = ud(v) + vd(u)$ for all $u, v \in U$. Our main goal in Theorem 2 will be to extend this result to σ-prime rings.

2 Preliminaries and notations

In the starting of this paper we should give some definitions and preliminary results to be used. Throughout, R will represent an associative ring with center $Z(R)$. R is said to be 2-torsion free if whenever $2x = 0$, with $x \in R$, then $x = 0$. As usual the commutator $xy - yx$ will be denoted by $[x, y]$. We shall use basic commutator identities $[x, yz] = y[x, z] + [x, y]z$, $[xy, z] = x[y, z] + [x, z]y$. An involution σ of a ring R is an anti-automorphism of order 2 (i.e. σ is an additive mapping satisfying $\sigma(xy) = \sigma(y)\sigma(x)$ and $\sigma^2(x) = x$ for all $x, y \in R$). Given an involutorial ring (R, σ), we define $Sa_\sigma(R) := \{r \in R / \sigma(r) = \pm r\}$. Recall that R is σ-prime if $aRb = aR\sigma(b) = 0$ implies that $a = 0$ or $b = 0$. It is worthwhile to note that every prime ring having an involution σ is a σ-prime ring but the converse is in general not true ([9]). A Lie ideal of R is an additive subgroup U of R satisfying $[U, R] \subset U$. A Lie ideal U of R is said to be a σ-Lie ideal, if $\sigma(U) = U$. If U is a σ-Lie ideal of R such that $u^2 \in U$ for all $u \in U$, then U is called a σ-square closed Lie ideal. For $u, v \in U, (uv + vu) = (u + v)^2 - (u^2 + v^2)$ and so $uv + vu \in U$. Also, $[u, v] = uv - vu \in U$ and it follows that $2uv \in U$. This remark will be freely used in the whole paper. A linear mapping T of a ring R into itself is called centralizing on a subset S of R if $[x, T(x)] \in Z(R)$ for every x in S. In particular, if T satisfies $[x, T(x)] = 0$ for all x in S then T is called commuting on S.

An additive mapping $d : R \longmapsto R$ is called a left derivation (resp. Jordan left derivation) if $d(xy) = xd(y) + yd(x)$ (resp. $d(x^2) = 2xd(x)$) holds for all pairs $x, y \in R$. Clearly, every left derivation is a Jordan left derivation, but the converse need not be true in general.

3 Centralizing automorphisms on σ-square closed Lie ideals

Let R be a prime ring of characteristic not 2 and U a Lie ideal of R with $U \not\subset Z(R)$. Bergen et al. proved in ([2], Lemma 4) that if $a, b \in R$ are such that $aUb = 0$, then either $a = 0$ or $b = 0$. This Lemma is the key of the intensive study of the relationship between several maps (especially derivations and automorphisms) and Lie ideals of prime rings. In particular, when this relationship involves the action of these maps on Lie ideals. Many of these results extend other ones proven previously just for the action of the maps on the whole ring. In this section, we are primarily interested in centralizing automorphisms on Lie ideals so that our first object will be the extension of Lemma 4 of [2] to σ-prime rings. This extension will also play an important role in the last section of the present paper.
In what follows R will denote a σ-prime ring of characteristic not 2.

Lemma 1 ([8], Lemma 4) *Let $0 \neq I$ be a σ-ideal of a 2-torsion free σ-prime ring R. If a, b in R are such that $aIb = 0 = aI\sigma(b)$, then $a = 0$ or $b = 0$.*

Lemma 2 *Let $0 \neq U$ be a σ-Lie ideal of a 2-torsion free σ-prime ring R. If $[U, U] = 0$, then $U \subset Z(R)$.*

Proof. Let $u \in U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$, from $[U, U] = 0$ it follows that $[u, [u, x]] = 0$ for all $x \in R$. Hence $d_u^2(x) = 0$ for all $x \in R$, where d_u is the inner derivation defined by $d_u(y) = [u, y]$. Replacing x by xy, we get $d_u(x)d_u(y) = 0$ for all $x, y \in R$ because $charR \neq 2$. If we replace x by xz in the last equality we obtain $d_u(x)zd_u(y) = 0$ for all $x, y, z \in R$, so that $d_u(x)Rd_u(y) = 0$. As $d_u \circ \sigma = \pm\sigma \circ d_u$ then $d_u(x)Rd_u(y) = 0 = \sigma(d_u(x))Rd_u(y)$ which proves $d_u = 0$ in such a way that $u \in Z(R)$. Consequently, $U \cap Sa_\sigma(R) \subset Z(R)$. Let $x \in U$, as $x + \sigma(x)$ and $x - \sigma(x)$ are in $U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$, then $x + \sigma(x)$ and $x - \sigma(x)$ are in $Z(R)$ so that $2x \in Z(R)$. Accordingly, x in $Z(R)$ proving $U \subset Z(R)$. ∎

Lemma 3 *Let $0 \neq U$ be a σ-Lie ideal of a 2-torsion free σ-prime ring R. If $[U, U] \neq 0$, then there exists a σ-ideal M of R such that $[M, R] \subset U$ with $[M, R] \not\subset Z(R)$.*

Proof. We have $R[U,U]R \subset T(U)$ by [2, Lemma 1] where $T(U) = \{x \in R : [x,R] \subset U\}$. Set $M = R[U,U]R$, clearly M is a nonzero σ-ideal of R such that $[M,R] \subset U$ and $[M,R] \not\subset Z(R)$. For if $[M,R] \subset Z(R)$, then $0 = [[m,rm],r] = [[m,r]m,r] = [m,r]^2$. As $[m,r] \in Z(R)$, this yields $[m,r] = 0$ so that $m \in Z(R)$ and thus $M \subset Z(R)$. For any $r,s \in R$, we have

$$rsm = mrs = (mr)s = s(mr) = srm \quad \text{for all } m \in M.$$

Hence $[r,s]m = 0$ thereby $[r,s]M = 0$. Applying Lemma 1, we find that $[r,s] = 0$ and R is then commutative which contradicts $[U,U] \neq 0$. ∎

All is prepared to introduce our main lemma which extends Lemma 4 of [2] to σ-prime rings.

Lemma 4 *If $U \not\subset Z(R)$ is a σ-Lie ideal of a 2-torsion free σ-prime ring R and $a,b \in R$ such that $aUb = \sigma(a)Ub = 0$, then $a = 0$ or $b = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose $b \neq 0$, we then conclude that $Ub \neq 0$. Otherwise, for any $x \in U$ we get $[x,r]b = 0$ for all $r \in R$. Replace r by rt, where $t \in R$, to get $0 = [x,rt]b = [x,r]tb$ so that $[x,r]Rb = 0$ for all $r \in R$. As $\sigma(U) = U$, it follows that $[x,r]Rb = 0 = \sigma([x,r])Rb$ and the σ-primeness of R yields $[r,x] = 0$ so that $U \subset Z(R)$ which contradicts $[U,U] \neq 0$. Consequently, there exists $u \in U$ such that $ub \neq 0$. On the other hand, by Lemma 3, there exists a nonzero σ-ideal M such that $[M,R] \subset U$ and $[M,R] \not\subset Z(R)$. Let $u \in U$, $m \in M$ and $r \in R$; in view of $[mau,r] \in [M,R] \subset U$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= a[mau,r]b \\ &= a[ma,r]ub + ama[u,r]b \\ &= a[ma,r]ub \\ &= amarub - armaub \\ &= amarub \end{aligned}$$

accordingly

$$amaRub = 0, \quad \text{for all} \quad m \in M.$$

Similarly, from $0 = \sigma(a)[m\sigma(a)u,r]b$ we find that $\sigma(a)m\sigma(a)Rub = 0$ for all $m \in M$. As $\sigma(M) = M$, then $amaRub = 0 = \sigma(ama)Rub$. Since R is σ-prime and $ub \neq 0$, then $ama = 0$ and therefore $aMa = 0$. On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= a[m\sigma(a)u,r]b \\ &= a[m\sigma(a),r]ub + am\sigma(a)[u,r]b \\ &= a[m\sigma(a),r]ub \\ &= am\sigma(a)rub - arm\sigma(a)ub \\ &= am\sigma(a)rub. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $am\sigma(a)Rub = 0$ for all $m \in M$. Since M is a σ-ideal we conclude that

$$am\sigma(a)Rub = 0 = \sigma(am\sigma(a))Rub.$$

Since $ub \neq 0$, the σ-primeness of R yields $am\sigma(a) = 0$ thereby $aM\sigma(a) = 0$. Consequently, $aMa = 0 = aM\sigma(a)$ and $a = 0$ by Lemma 1. ∎

Lemma 5 *Let U be a σ-square closed Lie ideal of a 2-torsion free σ-prime ring R having a nontrivial automorphism T centralizing on U and commuting with σ on U. If x in $U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$ is such that $T(x) \neq x$, then x in $Z(R)$.*

Proof. If $U \subset Z(R)$, then $x \in Z(R)$. Hence we can suppose that $U \not\subset Z(R)$ and thus $[U, U] \neq 0$ from Lemma 2. Linearizing $[u, T(u)] \in Z(R)$ we obtain $[u, T(y)] + [y, T(u)] \in Z(R)$ for all $u, y \in U$. In particular, we have $[u, T(u^2)] + [u^2, T(u)] \in Z(R)$ so that $(u + T(u))[u, T(u)] \in Z(R)$. Therefore, $0 = [u, (u + T(u))[u, T(u)]] = [u, T(u)]^2$. Since $[u, T(u)] \in Z(R)$, this forces $[u, T(u)] = 0$ for all $u \in U$. Linearizing this equality, we obtain

$$[T(u), y] = [u, T(y)] \quad \text{for all} \ \ u, y \in U. \tag{1}$$

Let x in $U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$ with $T(x) \neq x$. Replace y by $2xy$ and replace u by x in (1), using $\mathrm{char}(R) \neq 2$, we obtain $0 = (x - T(x))[T(x), y]$ for all $y \in U$. Write $2uy$ instead of y, we get $(x - T(x))u[T(x), y] = 0$ so that $(x - T(x))U[T(x), y] = 0$ and therefore

$$(x - T(x))U[T(x), y] = (x - T(x))U\sigma([T(x), y]) = 0 \quad \text{for all} \ \ y \in U.$$

Since $T(x) \neq x$, Lemma 4 yields that $[T(x), y] = 0$ for all y in U. Hence $[T(x), ry] = [T(x), yr]$ and thus $[T(x), r]y = y[T(x), r]$ for all $r \in R$. Replacing r by ru, where $u \in U$, we find that

$$[T(x), r]uy = y[T(x), r]u = [T(x), r]yu$$

in such a way that $[T(x), r][u, y] = 0$ which proves that $[T(x), r]R[U, U] = 0$. As U is invariant under σ, then

$$[T(x), r]R[U, U] = 0 = [T(x), r]R\sigma([U, U]).$$

Since $[U, U] \neq 0$, the σ-primeness of R yields $[T(x), r] = 0$ so that $T(x) \in Z(R)$. Since T is an automorphism, it then follows that $x \in Z(R)$. ∎

Now we are ready to state the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 1 *Let R be a 2-torsion free σ-prime ring having an automorphism $T \neq 1$ centralizing on a σ-square closed Lie ideal U. If T commutes with σ on U, then U is contained in $Z(R)$.*

Proof. If $[U,U] = 0$, then $U \subset Z(R)$ by Lemma 2. Hence, suppose that $[U,U] \neq 0$. If T is the identity on U, then

$$T([r,x]) = [r,x] = [T(r),x], \quad \text{for all } r \in R,\ x \in U. \tag{2}$$

Let us write ru instead of r in (2), where $u \in U$, thereby obtaining

$$T(r)[u,x] = r[u,x] \tag{3}$$

Now for any $r' \in R$, If we replace r by rr' in (3) and then employ (3), we have

$$(T(r) - r)r'[u,x] = 0$$

in such a way that $(T(r) - r)R[u,x] = 0$ for all $u, x \in U, r \in R$. Since U is invariant under σ, we then conclude that

$$(T(r) - r)R[u,x] = 0 = (T(r) - r)R\sigma([u,x]).$$

From $[U,U] \neq 0$, it follows that $T(r) = r$ for all $r \in R$ which is impossible. Hence T is nontrivial on U. Since R is 2-torsion free, then T is also nontrivial on $U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$. Therefore, there must be an element x in $U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$ such that $x \neq T(x)$ and x is then in $Z(R)$ by Lemma 5. Let $0 \neq y$ be in $U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$ and not be in $Z(R)$. Once again using Lemma 5, we obtain $T(y) = y$. But then

$$T(xy) = T(x)y = xy \quad \text{so that} \quad (T(x) - x)y = 0.$$

Since $x \in Z(R)$, it follows that $(T(x) - x)Ry = (T(x) - x)R\sigma(y) = 0$ proving $y = 0$, a contradiction. Hence for all y in $U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$, y must be in $Z(R)$. Now let x in U, the fact that $x - \sigma(x)$ and $x + \sigma(x)$ are in $U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$ assures that both $x - \sigma(x)$ and $x + \sigma(x)$ are in $Z(R)$ and thus $2x$ in $Z(R)$. Consequently, x in $Z(R)$ which proves $U \subset Z(R)$. ∎

4 Jordan left derivations on σ-square closed Lie ideals

In this section R will always denote a 2-torsion free σ-prime ring and U a σ-square closed Lie ideal of R. To introduce the main result of this section, we first state a few known results which will be used in subsequent discussion.

Lemma 6 ([7], Lemma 2.2) *Let R be a 2-torsion free ring and let U be a square closed Lie ideal of R. If $d : R \to R$ is an additive mapping satisfying $d(u^2) = 2ud(u)$ for all $u \in U$, then*
(i) $d(uv + vu) = 2ud(v) + 2vd(u)$, for all $u, v \in U$.
(ii) $d(uvu) = u^2d(v) + 3uvd(u) - vud(u)$, for all $u, v \in U$.
(iii) $d(uvw + wvu) = (uw + wu)d(v) + 3uvd(w) + 3wvd(u) - vud(w) - vwd(u)$, for all $u, v, w \in U$.
(iv) $[u,v]ud(u) = u[u,v]d(u)$, for all $u, v \in U$.
(v) $[u,v](d(uv) - ud(v) - vd(u)) = 0$, for all $u, v \in U$.

Lemma 7 ([7], Lemma 2.3) *Let R be a 2-torsion free ring and let U be a square closed Lie ideal of R. If $d : R \to R$ is an additive mapping satisfying $d(u^2) = 2ud(u)$ for all $u \in U$, then*
(i) $[u, v]d([u, v]) = 0$, for all $u, v \in U$.
(ii) $(u^2v - 2uvu + vu^2)d(v) = 0$, for all $u, v \in U$.

The fundamental result of this section states as follows:

Theorem 2 *Let R be a 2-torsion free σ-prime ring and let U be a σ-square closed Lie ideal of R. If $d : R \longrightarrow R$ is an additive mapping which satisfies $d(u^2) = 2ud(u)$ for all $u \in U$, then $d(uv) = ud(v) + vd(u)$ for all $u, v \in U$.*

Proof. Suppose $[U, U] = 0$ and let $u, v \in U$. From $d(u+v)^2 = 2(u+v)d(u+v)$, it follows that $2d(uv) = 2ud(u) + 2vd(v) - d(u^2) - d(v^2) + 2vd(u) + 2ud(v)$, in such a way that $2d(uv) = 2(ud(v) + vd(u))$ for all $u, v \in U$. As $char R \neq 2$, then $d(uv) = ud(v) + vd(u)$. Hence we shall assume that $[U, U] \neq 0$. According to Lemma 6 (iv) we have

$$(u^2v - 2uvu + vu^2)d(u) = 0, \quad \text{for all } u, v \in U. \tag{4}$$

Replacing u by $[u, w]$ in (4), where $w \in U$, and using Lemma 7 (i) we obtain $[u, w]^2vd([u, w]) = 0$ which implies that $[u, w]^2Ud([u, w]) = 0$ for all $u, w \in U$. Let $x, y \in Sa_\sigma(R) \cap U$, we have $[x, y]^2Ud([x, y]) = 0 = \sigma([x, y]^2)Ud([x, y])$ and by virtue of Lemma 4 either $[x, y]^2 = 0$ or $d([x, y]) = 0$. If $d([x, y]) = 0$, applying Lemma 6 (i) together with $\mathrm{char}(R) \neq 2$, we find that $d(xy) = xd(y) + yd(x)$. Now suppose that $[x, y]^2 = 0$; from Lemma 7 (ii) it follows that

$$(u^2v - 2uvu + vu^2)d(v) = 0, \quad \text{for all } u, v \in U.$$

Linearizing this relation in u, we obtain

$$(uwv + wuv - 2uvw - 2wvu + vuw + vwu)d(v) = 0, \quad \text{for all } u, v, w \in U.$$

Replacing v by $[x, y]$ and using Lemma 7 (i), we conclude that

$$(-2u[x, y]w - 2w[x, y]u + [x, y]uw + [x, y]wu)d([x, y]) = 0. \tag{5}$$

Write $u[x, y]$ instead of u in (5), since $[x, y]^2 = 0$, Lemma 7 (i) leads us to

$$[x, y]u[x, y]wd([x, y]) = 0, \quad \text{for all } u, w \in U.$$

Accordingly, $[x, y]u[x, y]Ud([x, y]) = 0$ for all $u \in U$. As $[x, y] \in U \cap Sa_\sigma(R)$, the fact that $\sigma(U) = U$ yields

$$[x, y]u[x, y]Ud([x, y]) = 0 = \sigma([x, y]u[x, y])Ud([x, y])$$

and using Lemma 4, either $d([x,y])=0$ or $[x,y]u[x,y]=0$ for all $u\in U$. If $d([x,y])=0$, then $d(xy)=xd(y)+yd(x)$ by Lemma 6 (i). If $[x,y]u[x,y]=0$ for all $u\in U$, then $[x,y]U[x,y]=0=\sigma([x,y])U[x,y]$. Once again using Lemma 4, we get $[x,y]=0$ and Lemma 6 (i) forces $d(xy)=xd(y)+yd(x)$. Consequently, in both the cases we find that

$$d(xy)=xd(y)+yd(x),\ \text{ for all }\ x,y\in U\cap Sa_\sigma(R). \tag{6}$$

Now, let $u,v\in U$; if we set

$$\begin{cases} u_1=u+\sigma(u), & u_2=u-\sigma(u)\\ v_1=v+\sigma(v), & v_2=v-\sigma(v)\end{cases}$$

then we have $2u=u_1+u_2$ and $2v=v_1+v_2$. Since $u_1,u_2,v_1,v_2\in U\cap Sa_\sigma(R)$, application of (6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} d(2u2v) &= d(u_1v_1+u_1v_2+u_2v_1+u_2v_2)\\ &= u_1d(v_1)+v_1d(u_1)+u_1d(v_2)+v_2d(u_1)\\ &+ u_2d(v_1)+v_1d(u_2)+u_2d(v_2)+v_2d(u_2)\\ &= 2ud(2v)+2vd(2u). \end{aligned}$$

As $\mathrm{char}(R)\neq 2$, it then follows that $d(uv)=ud(v)+vd(u)$, for all $u,v\in U$. ∎

Corollary 1 *Let R be a 2-torsion free σ-prime ring. Then every Jordan left derivation on R is a left derivation on R.*

References

[1] R. Awtar, *Lie ideals and Jordan derivations of prime rings.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 90 (1984), 9-14.

[2] J. Bergen, I. N . Herstein and J. W. Kerr, *Lie ideals and derivations of prime rings*, J. Algebra, 71 (1981), 259-267.

[3] J. Mayne, *Centralizing automorphisms of prime rings.* Canad. Math. Bull. 19 (1976), 113-115.

[4] J. Mayne, *Centralizing mappings of prime rings.* Canad. Math. Bull. 27 (1984), 122-126.

[5] J. Mayne, *Centralizing automorphisms of Lie ideals in prime rings*. Canad. Math. Bull. 35 (1992), 510-514.

[6] I. N. Herstein, *Topic in ring theory*. Univ of Chicago Press, Chicago 1969.

[7] A. Mohammad and N. Ur. Rehmann, *On Lie ideals and Jordan left derivations of prime rings*. Arch. Math. (Brno) 36 (2000), 201-206.

[8] L. Oukhtite and S. Salhi, *On commutativity of σ-prime rings*. Glas. Mat. Ser. III Vol. 41, no. 1 (2006), 57-64.

[9] L. Oukhtite and S. Salhi, *On generalized derivations of σ-prime rings*. Afr. Diaspora J. Math. Vol. 5, no. 1 (2006), 19-23.

[10] E. Posner, *Derivations in prime rings*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 8 (1957), 1093-1100.